



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/576,486

12/21/2006

Chie Ishikawa

0388-061179

6114

28289 7590 03/26/2008
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.
700 KOPPERS BUILDING
436 SEVENTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

ALLI, IYABO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2877

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/576,486	Applicant(s) ISHIKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner IYABO S. ALLI	Art Unit 2877	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/23/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Regarding claim **35**, the phrase "such that" renders¹the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
3. Regarding claim **36**, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Response to Amendment

4. Acknowledgement is given to previously cancelled claims 1-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims **19, 20, 24, 25 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kihira** (5,691,811).

As to claim 19, Kihira discloses irradiating an irradiation light having a predetermined pattern on an inspection target surface **3** (Column 4, lines 4-11 and Fig. 1); imaging the surface **3** irradiated with the irradiation light (Fig. 1); and inspecting the inspection target surface **3** based on an obtained image of the inspection target surface **3**, wherein the irradiation light irradiated from an irradiation face has a mesh-like pattern including meshes of a same shape (Column 4, lines 1-8 and Fig. 6A), each mesh having an irradiation area smaller than a non-irradiation area in a plane normal to an optical axis; and the inspection target surface **3** is inspected based on lightness/darkness information of an image area in the obtained image corresponding to a non-irradiated area in the inspection target surface **3** (Column 4, lines 39-46 and Figs. 2 and 6A).

Although, **Kihira** does not disclose a mesh pattern, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to know that the checkered pattern of **Kihira** can be interpreted as a mesh pattern because of the sequence it displays and the checkerboard patterns shown are typical of mesh patterns which can look like webs or a repetitive pattern.

As to claim 20, Kihira discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **in addition Kihira** discloses wherein if an image obtained is a normal obtained image when the irradiation light is irradiated on a normal inspection target

surface **3** and a brightness of the irradiation area in the normal obtained image is defined as a high brightness whereas a brightness of the non-irradiation area is defined as a low brightness; then, an intermediate brightness area which is present within the obtained image and which is an area of intermediate brightness between the high brightness and the low brightness is used as a target area **3** (Column 4, lines 52-68 and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 24, discloses an irradiating means for irradiating an irradiation light having a predetermined pattern on an inspection target surface Column 4, lines 4-11 and Fig. 1 (Column 4, lines 4-11 and Fig. 1); an imaging means for imaging the inspection target surface **3** irradiated with the irradiation light (Fig. 1); and an image processing means **5** for effecting an image processing on an image obtained by the imaging means, wherein the irradiating means **1** irradiates, from an irradiation face thereof, an irradiation light having a mesh-like pattern **2** including meshes of a same shape, each mesh having an irradiation area smaller than a non-irradiation area in a plane normal to the optical axis (Column 4, lines 29-34 and Figs. 1 and 6A); and the image processing means **5**, in the image processing, processes lightness/darkness information of an image area corresponding to a non-irradiated area in the inspection target surface **3** (Column 5, lines 7-15 & 27-33 and Fig. 4C).

As to claim 25, Kihira discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 24 above **in addition Kihira** discloses wherein if an image obtained is a normal obtained image when the irradiation light is irradiated on a normal inspection target surface **3** and a brightness of the irradiation area in the normal obtained image is

defined as a high brightness whereas a brightness of the non-irradiation area is defined as a low brightness (Column 4, lines 39-46 and Figs. 2 and 6A); the image processing means **5** includes an intermediate brightness area extracting means for extracting an intermediate brightness area which is present within the obtained image and which is an area of intermediate brightness between the high brightness and the low brightness (Column 5, lines 7-15).

And as to claim 27, Kihira discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 24 above **in addition Kihira** discloses wherein the irradiation light of the irradiating means **1** is formed through transmission between narrow slits **2** distributed in a mesh-like pattern (Column 4, lines 1-8 and Figs. 2 and 6A).

7. Claims **21-23** and **26, 28-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kihira** (5,691,811) in view of **Yoshida et al.** (5,963,328). ('**Yoshida**')

As to claim 21, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **except for** wherein an image area corresponding to the irradiation area in the inspection target surface is extracted as continuous light areas, and the continuous light areas are precluded from a target area.

However, **Yoshida** teaches wherein an image area corresponding to the irradiation area in the inspection target surface **10** is extracted as continuous light areas, and the continuous light areas are precluded from a target area **10** (Column 10, lines 57-62 and Figs. 1 and 6).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the extraction method of **Yoshida** in the defect inspection method of **Kihira** in order to accurately determine where the imperfections occur and to be able to differentiate between defects and non-defects.

As to claim 22, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **in addition Kihira** discloses wherein the image area corresponding to the non-irradiated area of the inspection target surface **3** is extracted for each enclosed dark area, and if an isolated light area is present within the enclosed dark area, the isolated light area is determined as a target area **3** (Column 5, lines 7-15 and Fig. 1).

As to claim 23, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **except for** wherein in case the inspection target surface is a curved surface, the mesh-like distribution of the irradiation light from the irradiation face corresponding to a shape of the curved surface of the inspection target surface is set as a circular or a regular polygonal mesh-like pattern in the obtained image.

However, **Yoshida** teaches wherein in case the inspection target surface **10** is a curved surface, the mesh-like distribution of the irradiation light from the irradiation face corresponding to a shape of the curved surface of the inspection target surface **10** is set as a circular or a regular polygonal mesh-like pattern in the obtained image (Column 10, lines 1-7 and Fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the correspondence to the curved shape of the surface of **Yoshida** in the inspection apparatus of **Kihira** to allow the apparatus to be used for uniform as well as non-uniform object under test, expanding the range of objects that can be inspected by the apparatus.

As to claim 26, Kihira discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 24 above **except for** wherein the irradiation light of the irradiating means is formed by a plurality of light emitting elements distributed in a mesh-like pattern.

However, **Yoshida** teaches wherein the irradiation light of the irradiating means is formed by a plurality of light emitting elements **11, 13** distributed in a mesh-like pattern (Column 8, lines 38-42 and Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the plurality of lights of **Yoshida** in the inspection apparatus of **Kihira** in order to illuminate large objects under test faster, allowing more objects to be inspected in a shorter time.

As to claim 28, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **except for** wherein in correspondence with a curved surface shape of the inspection target surface, the mesh-like distribution of the irradiation light from the irradiation face corresponding to the curved surface shape of the inspection target surface is set as a circular or a regular polygonal mesh-like pattern in the obtained image.

However, **Yoshida** teaches wherein in correspondence with a curved surface shape of the inspection target surface **10**, the mesh-like distribution of the irradiation light from the irradiation face corresponding to the curved surface shape of the inspection target surface **10** is set as a circular or a regular polygonal mesh-like pattern in the obtained image (Column 10, lines 1-7 and Fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the correspondence to the curved shape of the surface of **Yoshida** in the inspection apparatus of **Kihira** to allow the apparatus to be used for uniform as well as non-uniform object under test, expanding the range of objects that can be inspected by the apparatus.

As to claim 29, Kihira discloses an imaging camera **3** for imaging an inspection target surface **3** irradiated with an irradiation light of the light emitting elements **1** (Column 4, lines 4-11 and Fig. 1); and an outputting portion for outputting obtained image information of the imaging camera **4**, wherein the layout pattern comprises a continuous arrangement of the light emitting elements **1** thereby leaving a dark face of a predetermined shape therewithin (Column 5, lines 7-15 and Figs. 1 & 5A-5C); and the imaging camera **4** is disposed so as to receive, on at least one dark face, the irradiation light of each light emitting element **1** reflected off the inspection target surface **3** (Column 4, lines 57-62).

Kihira fails to disclose a plurality of light emitting elements arranged in a predetermined layout pattern.

However, **Yoshida** teaches a plurality of light emitting elements **11**, **13** arranged in a predetermined layout pattern (Column 8, lines 38-42 and Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the plurality of lights of **Yoshida** in the inspection apparatus of **Kihira** in order to illuminate large objects under test faster, allowing more objects to be inspected in a shorter time.

As to claim 30, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **in addition Kihira** discloses a defect evaluating portion **4** for detecting a defect on the inspection target surface **3** by evaluating an output signal from the outputting portion (Column 4, lines 29-34 and Figs.1 & 3A-3D).

As to claim 31, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **in addition Kihira** discloses wherein the layout pattern **2** comprises a repetitive pattern which repeats itself along a predetermined direction (Figs. 6A-6C & 7A-7C).

As to claim 32, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **in addition Kihira** discloses a conveying mechanism for moving the inspection target surface **3** along a direction relative to the plurality of light emitting elements **1** and the imaging camera **4**; wherein a direction of repetition of the layout pattern comprises the direction of relative movement (Column 4, lines 20-26 and Figs. 1 and 9).

As to claim 33, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **except for** wherein a light emitting face of the plurality of light emitting elements and an imaging face of the imaging camera are present in a common plane.

However, **Yoshida** teaches wherein a light emitting face of the plurality of light emitting elements **11, 13** and an imaging face of the imaging camera **12, 14** are present in a common plane (Column 8, lines 45-48 and Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the plurality of light emitting elements of **Yoshida** in the inspection apparatus of **Kihira** in order to eliminate possible interference during the illumination and detection steps within the inspection apparatus, insuring only accurate information is detected by the cameras.

As to claim 34, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **except for** a defect evaluating means for evaluating an output signal from the imaging camera, thus detecting a defect present on the inspection target surface; wherein the defect evaluating means includes an isolated point extracting portion for determining, as a defect candidate, a prominent brightness area isolated in a lightness/darkness image of the inspection target surface generated from the output signal, and a defect candidate discriminating portion operable to preclude, from the defect candidates, the defect candidate contained within an area

indicative of light emitting images of the continuously arranged light emitting elements in the lightness/darkness image.

However, **Yoshida** teaches a defect evaluating means **103** for evaluating an output signal from the imaging camera **C2, C2**, thus detecting a defect present on the inspection target surface **10** (Column 13, lines 20-27 and Fig. 17); wherein the defect evaluating means **103** includes an isolated point extracting portion **S2** for determining, as a defect candidate (Fig. 6), a prominent brightness area isolated in a lightness/darkness image of the inspection target surface **F** generated from the output signal, and a defect candidate discriminating portion **110** operable to preclude, from the defect candidates (Column 16, lines 34-42 and Fig. 17), the defect candidate contained within an area indicative of light emitting images of the continuously arranged light emitting elements **L1, L2** in the lightness/darkness image (Column 10, lines 58-61 and Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the extraction portion of **Yoshida** in the defect inspection method of **Kihira** in order to accurately determine where the imperfections occur and to be able to differentiate between defects and non-defects, improving calibration techniques within the apparatus.

As to claim 35, Kihira in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **except for** a preprocessing portion for effecting an image processing such that a brightness level of the continuous light emitting image area in an

actual inspection substantially agrees with a brightness level of a light emitting image of the continuously arranged light emitting elements obtained from a normal inspection target surface, the brightness level of the light emitting image obtained from a normal inspection target surface being employed as a reference for generating the lightness/darkness image from the output signal of the imaging camera.

However, **Yoshida** teaches a preprocessing portion for effecting an image processing such that a brightness level of the continuous light emitting image area in an actual inspection substantially agrees with a brightness level of a light emitting image of the continuously arranged light emitting elements **L1**, **L2** obtained from a normal inspection target surface (Column 16, lines 60-67), the brightness level of the light emitting image obtained from a normal inspection target surface being employed as a reference for generating the lightness/darkness image from the output signal of the imaging camera **C1**, **C2** (Column 9, lines 58-61).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the preprocessing portion of **Yoshida** in the inspection apparatus of **Kihira** in order to

And as to claim 36, **Kihira** in view of **Yoshida** discloses all of the claimed limitations as applied to Claim 19 above **in addition Kihira** discloses wherein a peripheral area including the prominent brightness area precluded from the defect candidate and an unnecessary image area such as a background **150** are integrated and masked as a defect determination non-target area relative to the obtained image;

and a masking operation is effected by determining an isolated point area precluded from the defect candidate together with an unnecessary image areas such as a background **150** as defect determination non-target area (Column 5, lines 51-57 and Fig. 8).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to IYABO S. ALLI whose telephone number is (571)270-1331. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thurs. 7:30a- 5pm, 1st F-OFF & 2nd F- 7:30a-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Toatley can be reached on 571-272-2059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IYABO S. ALLI

Application/Control Number: 10/576,486

Page 14

Art Unit: 2877

Examiner

Art Unit 2877

March 14, 2008

/L. G. Lauchman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2877